

1992

NOTES AND REFLECTIONS FOR THE ODA ANIMAL HEALTH PROJECT ON THE DEVELOPMENT
OF POVERTY-FOCUSSED LIVESTOCK SERVICES IN INDONESIA, WITH PARTICULAR
REFERENCE TO FARMER PARTICIPATION

Terms of Reference

The terms of reference for these notes are "to advise the Animal Health Project on the development of poverty-focussed livestock services, with particular reference to farmer participation". This ties in with the feasibility study for a possible future poverty-focussed livestock programme.

Programme

My visit has been brief but busy. I arrived in Jakarta on 9 November, travelled to Wajo District, South Sulawesi on 10th, spent the morning of 11th with livestock services field staff and had two contrasting field visits, on the afternoon of 11th and the morning of 12th, returning to Ujung Pandang on the afternoon of 12th. Useful discussions were held with villagers, veterinary services field staff, Dr. Djudjur Sembiring (Kepala Dinas Peternakar Dati II, Wajo), and Stephen Ashdown, Peter Bazeley and Sarah Holden of the ODA Animal Health Project. What follows is my responsibility and does not necessarily reflect the views of any of the above. I was helped by the excellent arrangements, and I have drawn on experience in and from other countries. In such a short visit it is, though, easy to be wrong. The points made are therefore less recommendations than observations, reflections, suggestions and leads and contacts for further action. I hope these prove of use.

The Context, Challenge and Strategy

The context, as I understand it, is that the current ODA Animal Health Project is coming to an end, and the Feasibility Study has started for a possible future poverty-focussed project. This would be an ODA project working with and through the Government of Indonesia and its livestock services. Evidently, this would fit well with new GOI priorities. In recent statements, the Director-General of Livestock Services has stressed the shortcomings of experience with top-down planning, and the priority attached by the Government of Indonesia to the development and introduction of bottom-up planning.

Successfully to develop, test and spread effectively poverty-focussed bottom-up planning and action in any field organisation which has operated in a centralised top-down manner is a formidable undertaking. Farmer participation is also difficult to facilitate through any technical staff who have received conventional professional training, and who are accustomed to a target-oriented top-down management style and procedures. Long, patient and persistent efforts and support will, I think, be required, with multiple mutually supporting initiatives. In this, the key is not hardware, but people and software. No blueprint will work. Any successful approach will have to be a sustained learning process, and will be staff-intensive. For this sort of project, continuity of staff committed to the task is crucial.

In this context, three reasons for seeking farmer participation deserve to be underlined:

i. Successful rural programmes focus on people and their livelihood systems, rather than only on one specialised aspect, such as crops, or trees, or livestock. It is the people themselves who are the experts on how livestock fit into their farming and livelihood systems, and on their priorities. If it is they who articulate their priorities for their livestock, then the whole of their livelihood system will be taken into account. If their priorities are then met, a programme is highly likely to be successful by most criteria.

ii. Participation is necessary as a means of expressing and giving weight to the interests and priorities of the poorer people, and of women. Usually there are biases in extension towards contact with those who are better off, and towards work with the larger animals and those that are more important to men than to women. Much depends on who is contacted, who analyses, and who participates. A sustained effort is needed to offset anti-poverty biases and to ensure participation by the poorer and by women so that their priorities count.

iii. Government staff can only cover a fraction of the needs of the population. In Wajo District, there is roughly one livestock services field staff member for 2,000 farm families, and nationally the figure is even less, at roughly 1 to 6,000. In the normal course of events, it is the better off, and those with larger animals, who receive the bulk of such thinly spread services. If the poorer, and those with smaller animals, are to benefit, the scale and accessibility of services have to be multiplied. Given Government budget and staffing constraints, this implies farmer participation in both demanding and providing services for themselves.

Against this background, I suggest that any strategy concentrate on five complementary areas:

- * Government procedures
- * Poverty-focussed Priorities, Actors and Roles
- * Methods
- * Learning experiences
- * Behaviour and attitudes

These are interlinked, as shown in the diagram.

1. Government Procedures

Decentralisation, bottom-up planning, and rationalisation of the work of field staff usually fail. It may help to list the common reasons, for unless these are effectively tackled, failure can be expected in Indonesia, despite the best of intentions and leadership:

a. financial discretion is not decentralised. Real discretion has to be given to staff at lower levels, and to lower levels than approved of by centrally placed accountants. The resistance of prudent and professional accountants must be resolutely overcome. Unless they are overruled, decentralisation will fail, as it has so often in other parts of the world.

b. reporting requirements are increased. Typically, field staff spend much of their time filling out ("making up" is sometimes closer to what is done)

numerous reports. To rationalise these, a simpler reporting system is then introduced. But in actual practice in the field, despite instructions to the contrary from on high, the new system, far from replacing the old, is merely added to it. The burden of reporting is then not eased but aggravated. It is vital, if simpler reporting is introduced, to ensure that all old reports stop. This can require diligent checking at the field level

c. change is enthusiastically ordered from the top without pilot testing and development first to iron out wrinkles like those above

d. top-down programmes persist, sustaining a management culture which inhibits participation.

This last deserves elaboration in the case of animal health services. Some animal health programmes (for immunisation, for the elimination of some diseases) are planned in a quasi-military style. It is perhaps not surprising that animal health staff wear uniforms. For immunisation programmes, top-down centralised planning and disciplined execution may sometimes be justified. But the authoritarian style of such programmes can be antithetical to participatory management, to local differentiation and diversity, and to the roles of friendly consultant and adviser which are required in bottom up, participatory planning and action. And if draconian measures for, say, the slaughter of infected animals are enforced, participation might as well be forgotten.

Combinations of four solutions or ways forward can be sought:

- i. to separate out two different services - one for top-down, and one for bottom-up planning and action
- ii. to seek alternatives to draconian animal health measures
- iii. to make immunisation, wherever possible, a service on request by farmers rather than a requirement imposed by Government
- iv. to pilot test and develop in one area only at first, and to resist early pressures to spread any new approaches or procedures to other areas. (Programmes of procedural change can be ruined by central fiat that they be adopted at once everywhere)

Perhaps the most realistic would be to combine ii., iii. and iv. in conjunction with the other measures suggested below.

2. Poverty-focussed Priorities, Actors and Roles.

In any participatory poverty-focussed animal health programme, new priorities will emerge, with new actors and roles, especially at the field level. The new priorities will be to fit the needs of the poorer. The new actors and roles will be to provide services on the scale needed, to poor people, and to facilitate their participation.

a. Priorities

In assessing poverty-focussed programme priorities, the question "who gains?" is central. The direct gains in human wellbeing are greater from smaller increments and reduced risk to the poorer than from larger

increments and reduced risk to the less poor. There are several ways of moving to a poverty focus, including obviously combinations of:

- * choosing a resource-poor region
- * consulting and enabling those who are poorer
- * helping the poorer people improve the performance of their livestock
- * reducing the vulnerability of their livestock to disease and death

In poverty-focussed bottom-up planning and action, priorities can be expected to change both in response to diverse local conditions and in response to the priorities of the poor. Priorities will vary, and programmes should also vary. Without prejudice to what might be best, case by case, it would seem that choice of species and reducing vulnerability are two major means for helping the poorer.

Reinforcing what is surely already known, the interviews, discussions, and matrix scoring during the visit to Wajo District, with analysis by both villagers and Government staff, confirmed these points. Through matrix scoring, all expressed the judgement that smaller animals, especially chickens, ducks and geese, are relatively more important to the poorer than to the less poor, and to women relatively more than men. These birds provide food, a steady source of income, a potentially rapid accumulation of value, and means for meeting small needs without having to sell or mortgage large assets. But all analysts (both Government staff and villagers) considered that the vulnerability of chickens to Newcastle disease was greater than the vulnerability of any other animal to any other disease. The villagers made the point by giving Newcastle disease a bad mark of 11 out of 10. Evidently, the benefits to the poorer from protection of their chickens from Newcastle disease is high indeed.

b. Actors and Roles

New actors are needed for fuller coverage, and new roles to support them. There may be many different forms of organisation, building on what already exists. But the case seems strong for supporting a new cadre of para-professionals at the village levels, who could be called paravets, and for the role of Government staff to shift from direct action themselves more to providing advice and support to the paravets.

i. paravets

Probably in all societies with domestic livestock, there are traditional practitioners, like the dukums in Indonesia, with their own skills and lore for preventing and treating sickness in animals. Often these local vets are respected, accessible to those who need their services, and flexible in the forms of reward they expect from their clients in return for their services. These qualities give them a natural advantage in serving the poorer people. But they suffer two disadvantages. First, they are often not acknowledged, respected, or sometimes even known about, by trained livestock staff. Second, they often do not have access to modern veterinary knowledge and facilities. The result can be that a vast national human resource passes unrecognised and underexploited.

In human health, major programmes have been undertaken for training and supporting similar local experts like traditional midwives. In animal health, but to the best of my knowledge on a smaller scale, encouraging experience has been gained through training local livestock practitioners

as paravets. In Bila village, Lapaukke, Wajo District, we met one such practitioner, Mrs Sandro Bintang, who was intelligent, lively and respected, but who had been partly marginalised through lack of access to and knowledge about immunisation, modern medicines and the like. She is, then, part of Indonesia's potential in the livestock sector, but underutilised.

The suggestion here is that the proposed ODA-supported project should institute, test and evolve a system of village paravets, to be supported by existing animal health staff. Some features of such a system might be:

- * paravets identified through local search and analysis. PRA methods such as participatory census and service mapping and chapati diagramming might be used.

- * perhaps 6-12 paravets for each Government field staff member

- * paravet training in all activities which they could take over from existing staff

- * exploration of alternative means of remuneration, including direct payment for services, and various ways of ensuring that the poorer have access

ii. Government staff

The roles of Government staff would then change. Each PPK would have a supervisory role for paravets, and would be responsible for training, monitoring and support. Much extension would be lateral, farmer to farmer, and paravet to paravet. Groups of farmers, as in the past, could be encouraged and supported.

In summary, roles of PPLs would include being:

- supporters and consultants for paravets
- convenors of groups
- facilitators of farmers' and paravets' own analysis, trials and monitoring
- searchers for needed information, materials and solutions to problems
- tour operators, enabling paravets and farmers to travel, visit and learn

These should be satisfying roles, continuing to give PPLs a recognised status, and enabling their work to have a much wider impact.

The outcome of these new roles can be illustrated with an example. Let us suppose that protection against Newcastle disease was identified by poor people in some areas as their top priority. Government staff would then train paravets in how to immunise against the disease. Either Government staff or the private sector would provide vaccines and refrigeration for use by the paravets. Whereas before, Government staff could themselves only vaccinate a fraction of chickens, and that with difficulty during daylight, paravets could vaccinate most chickens, and might be able to do this more easily after dark when they were roosting and easy to catch.

3. Approaches and Methods

The repertoire of available approaches and methods for appraisal, analysis and action has recently grown rapidly, and now includes the approaches and methods of participatory rural appraisal (PRA). A basic finding of PRA has been that most of the activities "we" (professionals, including Government staff at all levels) thought we had to do, we find farmers can do, and usually better than we could, providing our behaviour and attitudes are right, and rapport is good. This includes the following, all of which have direct applications with livestock:

- * participatory mapping of resources, including fodder distribution
- * human and animal census mapping, including identifying livestock specialists
- * farm mapping and nutrient flow diagramming (see papers by Lightfoot)
- * livestock census by household
- * wealth and wellbeing ranking
- * matrix scoring and ranking to compare different livestock species, breeds, diseases, fodders, treatments etc
- * analytical diagramming, including causal, flow, and linkage diagramming
- * diagramming institutions, sources of services, etc
- * seasonality diagramming
- * trend and change diagramming (in livestock numbers and composition, vegetation and fodders, incidence of diseases)
- * problem ranking and analysis
- * planning action

Most recently, village volunteers have been taking over as facilitators for these methods, and using them in other villages.

Information about these methods and approaches is available from several sources listed separately (See "Some sources...."). I recommend acquiring a full set of RRA Notes, available from Sustainable Agriculture Programme, International Institute for Environment and Development, 3 Endsleigh Street, London WC1H 0DD, together with a full set of their major reports for the past three years.

I do not feel it would be useful for me to try to recommend in detail which could or should be used and how. The Project has already been using, adapting and developing some of these to good effect, such as wealth ranking. Perhaps the best way forward is to continue this local R and D, and to tap into expertise and experience available elsewhere, as outlined below.

4. Learning Experiences

The challenge is what used to be called bureaucratic reorientation. The changes being contemplated amount to a major transformation of the culture of an organisation. The experience with PRA so far is that this requires understanding, support and experience at all levels, although the sequence can vary.

It has so far proved largely fruitless to start at the field level with field contact staff, when their supervisors have not themselves had the experience. It is not enough for supervisors to drop in and out of a PRA field learning experience. Nor does it work for the head of an organisation to be convinced and then try to order his staff to get involved. You cannot order people to change. Sometimes, the middle levels of organisations are proving a block.

Tentatively, let me suggest the following actions for discussion:

1. learn about the AKRSP and Vietnam experiences.

A visit to AKRSP to learn about their village volunteers programme, and also about their experiences with PRA, could be well worth while. It might emerge that AKRSP could provide much of the outside training that could be needed. AKRSP has so far resisted this, and turned down a big opportunity in Vietnam. It may now be, though, that they will be more prepared to consider this. The contact there would be Anil C. Shah, the Chief Executive. (Meera and Parmesh Shah are both from AKRSP but at IDS. All are on good terms with one another)

A visit to Vietnam (Le Minh Tue and Bardolf Paul) could be invaluable, as they have been introducing and evolving PRA with Government staff and without NGO training support. Parmesh Shah has recently spent 3 weeks with them advising about the development through Government of a system of village volunteer extension agents (cf paravets above).

Either or both of these might lead to visits to Vietnam by AKRSP or Vietnam staff for further sharing of experience. Or to visits from Indonesia to Gujarat or Vietnam.

If Mallika Samaranayake comes to Indonesia again, it would also be good to tap her experience of NGOs working with Government in Badulla and Kurenagala Districts, in Sri Lanka, and also with Intercooperation and IFAD. She could advise on snags that could be avoided, and on positive aspects.

2. keep in touch with other developments in Indonesia and the Philippines

Mary Kingsley's letter (attached) indicates that things are moving quite fast here following Mallika Samaranayake's visit, and that Indonesians may be going to MYRADA in India for training in January.

Similarly, I rather expect that developments will be quite rapid in the NGO sector in the Philippines. You could write to Jimmy Mascarenhas and ask him his views about potential trainers/sharers of experience there. The International Institute for Rural Reconstruction may well become a leader in PRA training.

Thinking regionally, Australia is tempting with their incipient PRA, but as far as I can make out they are a year or two behind methodologically in some respects, and have developed other high tech methods for large areas which would not fit Indonesian conditions.

3. plan sequences of experiences

Setting up sequences of experiences deserves a lot of thought. Quite a good one, which worked in Sri Lanka, was:

i. interest taken by foreign staff of an outside organisation with flexible resources (Intercooperation, for which read ODA)

ii. middle range nationals go to MYRADA in India for field experiences

iii. Intercooperation (ODA) staff gain further experience in other countries

iv. trainers invited from other countries to facilitate field experiences in Sri Lanka (Indonesia), with the Intercooperation (ODA) staff and those who had been to MYRADA as participants/resource persons/facilitators.

v. one-day workshop in Colombo (Jakarta) for senior staff to get direct feedback following the field experience, with results and reflections presented by participants and if possible villagers.

But there will surely be several other good sequences.

4. share

Sharing experience - between NGO and government staff, between villagers and outsiders, between people from different countries - has a part to play in good PRA, and in a culture of openness. It would certainly help if others in Indonesia, outside Government, could be involved.

Some of those well qualified and experienced. who could provide PRA training in Indonesia are, in alphabetical order:

* Sheelu Francis
(address to follow)

* Ravi Jayakaran Enthusiastic and capable. The only PRA trainer who
World Vision to my knowledge is a qualified vet (Dr)
Madras, India

* James Mascarenhas (very experienced. Has conducted training in
(address to follow) India (perhaps 100 times), Nepal, Philippines..soon
in Zimbabwe and Kenya. Left MYRADA in order to devote
himself full-time to PRA training.
Bangalore, India

* Neela Mukherjee (Dr)
LBS National Academy of Administration
Mussoorie
U.P., India

She trains, each year, 320-odd IAS probationers in the use of PRA methods for their field attachments in villages. I have conducted training in Botswana jointly with her. Good with Government people. Gentle no-nonsense.

* MYRADA,
2 Service Road,
Domlur Layout,
Bangalore 560 071, India

tel: 91-812-576166

Contact Aloysius Fernandez, who is Chief Executive, or Vidya Ramachandran (Ms) who is in charge of training. MYRADA probably has a larger number of competent PRA trainers than any other organisation. They do quite a lot of training for Government, including for the ODA-supported Western Ghats Project.

* Bardolf Paul
c/o Interforest - Bai Bang

tel: (Bai Bang) 42-54080
tel: (Hanoi) 42-32046

P.O.Box 1226
Nana Post Office
Bangkok 10112

Canadian citizen, I think. With Le Minh Tue, initiating PRA among Government staff in Vietnam, where they have been pioneering PRA, and with recent advice and support from Parmesh Shah, developing through Government a system of village volunteers with some parallels to the proposed paravets.

* Dorothee Rojahn
Intercooperation (see below)

Dorothee and Mallika work together. Dorothee, who is from Germany, took the initiative in getting PRA going in Sri Lanka, and is a good trainer. Invaluable experience on how to introduce PRA in a country.

* Mallika Samaranayake (who has already conducted training in Indonesia
Intercooperation
92/2 D.S.Senanayake Mawatta
Colombo 8, Sri Lanka
tel: 94-1-691215
fax: 94-1-687467/695979

Mallika has already conducted PRA training in Indonesia, which evidently went very well. I have a high regard for her as a trainer

* Anil Shah tel: 91-272-464029/464730
Executive Director
Aga Khan Rural Support Programme (India)
Choice Premises
Swastik Cross Road
Navrangpura
Adhmedabad 380 009
Gujarat, India
Anilbhai is a retired IAS officer, formerly the Gujarat Secretary of Rural Development, who has become one of the main innovators in PRA (e.g. shoulder tapping). He would be excellent in the field with senior civil servants. As a senior person himself, he could perhaps explain (and tap shoulders) in an acceptable way. He also knows a good deal about livestock, I think.

* Meera Shah, tel: 44-273-606261
IDS fax: 44-273-621202
University of Sussex
Brighton BN1 9RE, UK

Meera has extensive experience of monitoring and evaluation (with the National Dairy Development Board, and then AKRSP, in India), and more recently with leading an AKRSP spearhead team of 12 professionals in a tribal District (Bharuch) in Gujarat. Has conducted PRA training in Norway and Sweden. Likely to be conducting PRA training in Sabah in December (?worth a side trip to Indonesia for a discussion).

* Parmesh Shah
also IDS

Parmesh was number 2 in the Aga Khan Rural Support Programme, in India, until recently when he came to IDS. Has advised Vietnam on the introduction of village volunteers through Government. An experienced PRA trainer. Has conducted jointly conducted workshops in Canada, Norway, Sweden and Vietnam

(Meera and Parmesh are wife and husband. The three of us in May conducted PRA workshops in Sweden)

Although I am not sure whether she has conducted training, I recommend an Indonesian social anthropologist who took part in PRA training, with Mallika Samaranayake, Dorothee Rojahn and myself in Sri Lanka in January 1992. Her name is

Yang Suwan,
Hn Bendi VII/14
Tanah Kusir
Jakarta Selatan

She would be a good ally in any training

In any case, except perhaps for James Mascarenhas, I would recommend having more than one trainer/facilitator, and giving them a couple of days together before starting.

5. Behaviour and Attitudes

I have given this a separate heading because it is as basic as it is habitually neglected in training.

The experience with PRA has been that personal behaviour and attitudes are more important than methods. Good PRA requires low key facilitation, and watching, listening, asking and learning, not ordering and teaching.

Admirably the pamphlet Our Client The Smallholder: meeting the needs of Indonesia's livestock farmers stresses sitting, listening and learning. The photographs show staff sitting equally with farmers, which is a great step forward, and in the photographs the relationships are shown as friendly and easy. One can still ask: who holds the plant? Whose finger wags? Whose model is demonstrated? Whose diagram is explained? These questions are not to say that these should always be avoided, but that more and more "they" should be doing these things.

A major methodological frontier is how better, faster, and more enjoyably, to facilitate changes in behaviour and attitudes. There is vast experience in the world, but it has not been tapped much yet in PRA/ farmer first. Watch this space.

Concluding

Thank you for a good experience. I hope these notes help. Do not hesitate to be in touch again, either with me or with my secretary, Helen McLaren, if you would like more information.

Yogyakarta
15 November 1992

Robert Chambers
Institute of Development Studies
University of Sussex
Brighton BN1 9RE
UK